



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### **REVIEW: Historical atlases: the first three hundred years, 1570-1870. By Walter Goffart.**

**Citation for published version:**

Withers, C 2005, 'REVIEW: Historical atlases: the first three hundred years, 1570-1870. By Walter Goffart.', *Historical Journal*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 833-834. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05214814>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1017/S0018246X05214814](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X05214814)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Published In:**

Historical Journal

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Published in The Historical Journal by Cambridge University Press (2005)

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# The Historical Journal

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HIS>

Additional services for *The Historical Journal*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

**Historical atlases: the first three hundred years, 1570–1870. By Walter Goffart. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. Pp. xxiii+603. ISBN 0-226-30071-4. £45.50.**

CHARLES W. J. WITHERS

The Historical Journal / Volume 48 / Issue 03 / September 2005, pp 833 - 834  
DOI: 10.1017/S0018246X05214814, Published online: 12 September 2005

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0018246X05214814](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0018246X05214814)

**How to cite this article:**

CHARLES W. J. WITHERS (2005). The Historical Journal, 48, pp 833-834  
doi:10.1017/S0018246X05214814

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## OTHER REVIEWS

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05214814,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*Historical atlases: the first three hundred years, 1570–1870*. By Walter Goffart. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. Pp. xxiii + 603. ISBN 0-226-30071-4. £45.50.

‘As soon as men begin to talk about anything that really matters someone has to go and get the atlas.’ So wrote Rudyard Kipling in 1928. Women too no doubt, but for Kipling, other men and women alike, the type of atlas consulted would matter. In so far as it may be said to have a single origin, the atlas was ‘invented’ in 1570 with the publication by Abraham Ortelius of *Theatrum orbis terrarum*, a then comprehensive collection of maps of the world’s countries bound together and with the maps at uniform size. From this late Renaissance beginning, the atlas has developed as a particular and varied genre of geographical and historical enquiry: eighteenth-century English county atlases; nineteenth-century physiographical, botanical, and ethnographical works in which the French and the Germans took the lead; national atlases; atlases for school children; modern road atlases to name only a few.

Walter Goffart’s focus is the historical atlas, that genre of atlas that aimed to depict the state of a nation or country, or to elaborate a particular theme within a nation’s history, for a given moment or period. Geography in this sense, as Ortelius recognized, was vital to historical understanding, an ‘eye to history’ as he and others put it (chronology being the other ‘eye’). The study of ancient geography in particular – of Biblical geographies, of the physical features, boundaries, and place-names of the Greek and Roman worlds, and so on – aided historical study. Ortelius’s *Theatrum orbis terrarum* thus established a form of publishing, a type of geographical representation and a method of historical enquiry. Much has changed since. Historical atlases representative of the genre – in general the publication of maps *of* and *for* history – today fall into two broad types: those devoted to general or world history, and those which illustrate medieval and modern European history. Reflecting, perhaps, his own distinguished career as a medieval historian, Goffart’s work examines in detail the intellectual origins and distinctive features of the second type. The central concern of the book is with how the middle ages – which, even to this non-expert, Goffart seems to define loosely as a period – were depicted cartographically in historical atlases. Thus, chapter two considers the Middle Ages in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century maps, chapter four eighteenth-century maps of the middle ages, and chapter six nineteenth-century maps of the period. Interleaved with these are discussions on stylistic developments and several unrealized atlases of Europe’s presumed universal history in the eighteenth century (chapter three), and the ‘coming of age’ (p. 303) of the historical atlas in the nineteenth century, principally with respect to German historical and cartographic scholarship (chapter five).

The overall result is a well-written, wide-ranging, and informative account of how maps have been used for history and of how maps, not just for the medieval period, depicted important themes in European history. Attention is paid to the historical boundaries of France, for example, to the geographical migration of Europe’s peoples and to the western

cartographic conception of the Islamic world 'Outside Europe' (p. 222). Cartographic conceptions of universal history such as Johann Christoph Gatterer's sixty-six map 'Atlas complet des révolutions' of 1775 reveal the power attributed to maps in teaching comparative history in the Enlightenment. Historical atlases and national atlases in the nineteenth century depicted the central place of different nation states in the emergence of 'modern' Europe. Goffart's work draws upon modern scholarship in several European languages and first-hand examination of the maps and atlases in question in numerous archives. A detailed catalogue of the maps and atlases in question takes up a little over a hundred pages at the end of the volume, and incorporates a summary finding aid with notes on the contents of the relevant works. The result is, thus, both a cartobibliography and an exegesis of a particular historical genre. It will be particularly valuable to historical scholars of medieval Europe who, perhaps more so than they customarily do, should take seriously the 'where' of things in understanding their 'how' and 'why'. In saying this and without diminishing my admiration for a fine work of scholarship, two other points might be made. First, Goffart perhaps too often adopts a normative, even a 'presentist' tone, taking later atlases and maps to be better than earlier ones, 'modern' maps to have 'attained maturity' (p. 359) over their predecessors. Such an interpretative stance does not always sit comfortably with the importance now placed upon context and relativist appraisal in the history of cartography. Secondly, we are told relatively little about the making of the maps and atlases (or, indeed, of their markets and audiences). Yet it was in this period that map production moved from being the preserve of mariners, intellectual geographers, commercial publishers, and land measurers towards being the domain of professional surveyors with military mapping as an arm of the state. Even some mention of these issues would have added a welcome social-historical dimension to the account. We thus have a valuable narrative of how maps were used for history, but not a view of the politics and power of mapping in history.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

CHARLES W.J. WITHERS

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05224810,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. By Felicity Heal. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xviii + 568. ISBN 0-19-826924-2. £84.00.

It is no surprise that Felicity Heal should have written a survey of the Reformation. She is, after all, one of the most precise and most eloquent historians of the church in sixteenth-century England at work today. It has been more than a decade since the last thorough textbook survey of the English Reformation – Christopher Haigh's polemical *English reformations* (1993) – and Heal is just the scholar to bring the picture up to date in a cooler yet equally incisive way.

However, Heal has in fact attempted something more ambitious. Since the 1970s, provoked by the New Zealander, John Pocock, and in tandem with rising nationalism in Ireland, Wales, Scotland, and (last, as usual) England, we have seen the shaky emergence of a 'new British history': an attempt to retell the histories of Great Britain and Ireland without either disintegrating them into three, four, or five separate national stories or grafting them into the narrative of English expansionism. This British history has

a particular interest in interactions between the non-English peoples, and in how the 'periphery' of the archipelago has affected the English 'centre'. It has been obviously fruitful. No one would now try to analyse the conflict which we used to call the English Civil War without acknowledging its decisive British dimensions, nor forget the distinctive Scottish contribution to later British imperialism.

Yet can there be 'British history', new or old, before the creation of a unified British monarchy in 1603? In the last decade, several historians have explored this. Clare Kellar has produced a valuable study of the links between the English and Scottish Reformations; Susan Brigden, an important textbook integrating the English and Irish stories of the sixteenth century. Several such studies have focused on individuals (often Scots) whose careers spanned the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland: Roger Mason's valuable collection on *John Knox and the British reformations*, or Jane Dawson's biography of the fifth earl of Argyll, whose own territories almost comprised a fourth British kingdom. Building on these and other historians, Heal has contributed a volume to the Oxford History of the Christian Church aiming to examine the entire Reformation from a British perspective.

As she admits, the Reformation is not a straightforwardly 'British' topic. The three British kingdoms were bit players in a European drama; moreover, England's political Reformation, Scotland's revolutionary Reformation, and Ireland's failed Reformation contrast more obviously than they compare. There are certainly connections, aside from mere neighbourhood. England and Ireland both acknowledged the Tudor monarchs, although in very different ways; Scotland's and Ireland's Gaelic communities were closely linked; and from 1542 onwards, the possibility of a dynastic union of some kind tangled English and Scottish politics together. The Scottish Reformation spoke with Knox's Anglophile voice and was enforced by English arms. The Irish Reformation, too, was an English-dominated affair. Yet all three kingdoms also had substantial links with the Continent, which provided Catholics and Protestants in all three realms with ideologies, missionaries, and – when necessary – refuge. It is not obvious that Britain and Ireland are an obvious stage on which to survey the Reformation.

Heal's answer to such doubts is to draw out two principal themes which allow her to examine the three kingdoms in parallel. The first of these is the primacy of politics. Inevitably, this focuses on England. It was England, both the most powerful and the best-documented polity in the archipelago, which first introduced an anti-papal theme into British politics: a theme which Ireland grudgingly echoed, and which rebalanced Scottish regimes of every religious complexion. Heal's sparky retelling of the familiar English story almost conceals the depth of her research; and, as often in this book, her attention to British perspectives refreshes simply by providing a different viewpoint. She does not force the different political stories together artificially, but she does parallel them. This is particularly valuable for Ireland, whose Reformation emerges here largely as a political event imposed by England, resisted even by the Anglo-Irish elite. To concentrate on politics, however, also implies a particular version of England's own story: a slow, late, and long Reformation 'from above'. Heal applies that model to all three kingdoms, comparing, for example, how Catholic resurgence eventually blocked the Protestant missionary effort in Gaelic Ireland and Scotland (although not, intriguingly, in Wales).

The strongest sections of this book, however, trace Heal's second theme: the slow emergence of a British Protestant culture. She makes fruitful comparisons between the post-Reformation religious landscapes in England and Scotland, as recently analysed in

outstanding books by Alexandra Walsham and Margo Todd. English religious culture changed more deeply than it has recently been fashionable to admit, and Scotland's revolutionary Reformation conceals more continuity than has usually been acknowledged. The contrasts remain, but the similarities are real, and not coincidental: after 1560 England was, for the first time, Scotland's main cultural conduit to the outside world. Wisely, Heal does not try to use these links to suggest a new, 'British' national identity emerging: the occasional bursts of 'British' idealism during the sixteenth century rarely survived prolonged contact with members of the other nations.

This book is a *tour de force*; a virtuoso performance which demonstrates that it is possible to write a generalized 'British' history of the disunited kingdoms which is not merely legitimate but positively illuminating. Possible: but not easy. This book will be widely read, but I doubt if it will have many imitators. Heal has told the story of the 'British' Reformations, but there are other, equally convincing Reformation narratives: local, Continental, bilateral, and – especially given the primacy which Heal rightly gives to politics – those centred on individual kingdoms. Heal has unmistakably set a new standard for histories of the British Reformations. She may also turn out to have had the last word.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

ALEC RYRIE

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05234817,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*A history of the University of Cambridge*, II: 1546–1750. By Victor Morgan with a contribution by Christopher Brooke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xxii + 613. ISBN 0-521-35059-X. £85.00.

The second volume of the *History of the University of Cambridge*, the final one to appear, has been eagerly awaited for some time now, both for the publication of the findings of the principal author first set down in his doctoral dissertation of 1983 and for the completion of a hitherto lacunose series. The title-page describes the volume as being by Victor Morgan 'with a contribution by Christopher Brooke', who is the General Editor of the *History* and the author of its twentieth-century volume. Morgan's chapters are ample and rich, but Brooke's contribution is nonetheless also an extensive one, and the lesser prominence of his name on the title-page is perhaps best accounted for by the reference in the preface to the RAE, 'to which Victor Morgan is still subject'.

Both authors have their chosen territory, and the reader comes to appreciate the personality and preoccupations of each well in the course of the volume. Morgan, the historian of Cambridge who has apparently (bibliography items Morgan 1968 and 1983) never studied there, is, above all, concerned with relations between the University and the country (both localities and the state) in every respect except the intellectual; Brooke, the Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History emeritus and historian of Gonville and Caius, who is clearly quite at home in the University, and is at his sparkling best on the implications of its architecture for its social, intellectual, and political life (chapter 2).

Victor Morgan's chapters, which concentrate on the period up to 1640, develop from deep archival research a decisive advance on previously published studies of the social and political history of the University. Many broader theses in the history of this period are

examined through the lens and refined in the crucible of Cambridge: the University reflects the transition in the eighteenth century from a court-centred to a parliamentary political culture (p. 101); county allegiance remained a central aspect of the University's (as also the country's) experience (p. 183); heads of houses (masters of colleges) were regarded, quite literally, as equivalent to the head of a great household, with scholars and fellows consequently having the status of servants (pp. 150, 257); the University was a source of electoral experience that was subsequently deployed in the country and the commons (p. 346); and, overall, that the universities became increasingly central to the concerns of the state and the wider society up to the 1670s, after which followed a period of relative marginalization.

It is when the volume comes on to the questions that are both the most important, but also the hardest easily to answer, about an early modern university – the intellectual work that was done there – that its uneven genesis betrays it. The treatment of the history of scholarship in Cambridge – the studies in rhetoric, logic, humanity, philology, philosophy (natural, moral, civil, metaphysical), and divinity is second-hand and sporadic. Professor Brooke's own background in the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages is in evidence in his interesting, but ultimately insufficient, suggestion that the longevity of the liberal arts course 'is a measure not of the blind conservatism of the Cambridge tutors, but of the enlightenment of their medieval predecessors' (p. 519). But the details of the curriculum in this volume are both elusive and rather derivative, with much use being made of the detailed studies of Feingold, Gascoigne, and Twigg. Future historians of the University's intellectual life (there is still room for them) will need to go beyond the curricular outlines of Holdsworth, Dupont, Barnes, and Waterland into manuscript notes, themes, orations, and booklists.

Brooke makes an important point when he argues that the history of science (that is, the natural sciences) and the history of scholarship have a vital affinity in this period, and that this affinity has not been sufficiently appreciated (p. 466); and he is properly conscious that this affinity is particularly (but not uniquely) apparent in the intellectual preoccupations of Isaac Newton. But the account of the history of scholarship in this volume is seriously deficient – treating Richard Bentley as a *deus ex machina* will no longer do – and the history of science is burked; and in this regard Brooke is unwise to cavil at the scholar, Anthony Grafton, who has done most to develop and explore these affinities across early modern European history (p. 484 n. 1).

Brooke makes a brave endeavour to cover the important ground, ranging from the Predestinarian debate of the 1570s onwards (properly developing the work of Séan Hughes) through the Cambridge Platonists and Richard Brady to the founding of the Regius Professorship of Modern History. And a single volume of university history, even one of 600 pages, that covers 200 years, cannot hope to include every episode of significance in the period. One might expect it, nonetheless, to include or at least allude to discussion of events that have preoccupied recent historians. In this respect the silence of this volume about the anti-Quaker controversialist, Thomas Smith, or Daniel Scargill, or Isaac Dorislaus (but see p. 86 n. 85), veers from the regrettable to the serious. The bid to rehabilitate William Dell as a 'minor prophet' (p. 472) of the modern curriculum is audacious even for a fellow-Caian.

We have, in the end, two books here; one a profoundly researched investigation of the University's relations with the outside world up to the onset of civil war; the other a synthesis of existing studies combined with some more and some less successful personal

explorations. Since this is so, might there not have been a case for including further contributors still – who could have added to the external history of the University an original and up-to-date account of its intellectual history? Such contributors might have found themselves moved to attempt to bring together the curricular transformations treated schematically here with the political and social developments treated, up to 1640, so richly.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

R. W. SERJEANTSON

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05244813,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*Private ambition and political alliances: the Phélypeaux de Pontchartrain family and Louis XIV's government, 1650–1715.* By Sara E. Chapman. University of Rochester Press: Rochester, NY, 2004. Pp. xv + 291. ISBN 1-58046-153-0. £55.00.

Of the three great ministerial families in the age of Louis XIV, the Phélypeaux have received less attention from historians than either the Colbert or the Le Tellier. The absence of any dominating figure like Jean-Baptiste Colbert or François-Michel Le Tellier, marquis de Louvois, has played its part in this neglect, as does the fact that the rapid and impressive rise of the Phélypeaux took place during the later, and far less studied, decades of the king's reign. Rehabilitating the Phélypeaux as a ministerial dynasty is therefore an important task, neglected by French historians with the exception of Luc Boissard's overarching genealogical history of the family. The Phélypeaux, like the Colbert, had split into two major branches, the Pontchartrain and the La Vrillière; relations between the two deteriorated badly after 1621 when the Pontchartrain accused the La Vrillière branch of appropriating the post of secretary of state for protestant affairs. While the La Vrillière enjoyed continued political success, the Pontchartrain branch was rocked by another crisis when Louis II, *président* of the *chambre des comptes*, was one of the judges disgraced for refusing to vote for the execution of the finance minister, Nicolas Fouquet. From this perspective, the recovery of the Pontchartrain under Louis III Phélypeaux de Pontchartrain, who rose successively through *premier président* of the Parlement of Brittany (1677–89), through controller general of finances (1689–99), to chancellor (1699–1714), is a spectacular achievement, largely owed to Louis III's combination of administrative and political ability, and the skilful deployment of patronage on his behalf, above all that of Claude Le Peletier, ally of the Le Tellier, and Louis III's immediate predecessor as controller general. There is undoubtedly a case to be made for Louis III as one of the great ministerial success-stories of the seventeenth century, worthy of a serious biographical and contextual study.

Interestingly, this is not Sara Chapman's intention: one of the defining moments in a career otherwise dedicated to royal service, Louis III's opposition to the king over the demand that the Parlement of Paris register the Papal Bull *Unigenitus*, which led him to resign the chancellorship, is dealt with in a short paragraph in the book's conclusion. The study is not directly about Pontchartrain as policymaker, nor about the ways in which his personality and interests may have interacted or clashed with the king, with other ministers or powerful courtiers. Instead it offers a detailed study of clientage networks, the practical means by which the Pontchartrain recovered and expanded their political position and,



once in post, worked with or through personal, institutional and local interests to carry out the duties and requirements of office. It has been easy to assert that clientage was the motor of seventeenth-century government, and that policy was made through the elaborate squaring off of interests and requests in return for support, but it requires a far more rigorous immersion in the archives to demonstrate how this worked in practice. Chapman offers a hugely detailed account of precisely whom, for example, Louis III worked with during his time as *premier président* in Brittany, and of those amongst the administrative elites within the financial administration who were part of his clientele when he was controller general. The study provides an unsurpassed account of the actual mechanisms of government, whether within the financial, legal, or naval administrations. The names and details of the cast of allies, associates, and appointees may seem daunting, but it is through this detail that it becomes possible to appreciate the scale and complexity of such personalized systems of rule, and their continuation through a period traditionally associated with the growth of centralized, increasingly professional administration.

The absence of a pre-existing political study of the Phélypeaux can occasionally make this specific, focused approach disconcerting. Louis III was controller general throughout the Nine Years' War, when the financial demands on the French state increased exponentially in a deteriorating economic situation. There are hints of the demands that this placed upon Louis III and of his approach to crisis management. The major watersheds of the period, above all the introduction of the *Capitation*, are discussed, but the self-imposed brief of the book remains to show the complex networks of clients and allies through which Pontchartrain was able to make good the authority of the crown in the financial administration and the provinces. The contextual questions of whether Louis III was more than an astute political operator, whether he had a distinct and creative contribution to make to the survival of the French state in the midst of a period of acute financial crisis, and whether he represented more than a successful personification of the essentially personal and informal nature of French government under Louis XIV are at best confronted tangentially, as indeed is the problem of the highly capable father seeking to build the career of an arrogant, politically insensitive, and intermittently idle son, Jérôme Phélypeaux. Moreover, Chapman's detailed study of Pontchartrain client-networks and systems of personal relations eclipse previous work done on the Colbert, Le Tellier, and other ministerial families, and inevitably this raises comparative questions which cannot be discussed within the scope of the present work. Neither of these caveats detracts from the dense scholarship and ground-breaking detail of the present work, which will certainly contribute to an overdue reassessment of the role of the Phélypeaux in the political history of the *ancien régime*.

NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD

DAVID PARROTT

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X0525481X,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*The character of credit: personal debt in English culture, 1740–1914*. By Margot C. Finn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xii + 362. ISBN 0521823420. £50.00.

Margot Finn's book is an outstanding example of a new type of history that might be called the 'history of economic culture'. Drawing upon the insights of anthropology and

'new-historicist' literary criticism as well as social and cultural history, this work examines the complex and multi-faceted ensemble of social relations and cultural meanings attached to personal debt in English culture between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. Partly inspired by the work of Craig Muldrew and other early modern revisionists, it argues convincingly that credit relations and their role in the economy can, and should, be made the object of interpretation and set in non-reductionist frames of analysis, aside from more conventional economic history methods. In its focus on the social history of consumers and their relations to the new worlds of goods and services it falls into step with the recent shift in emphasis from the supply- to the demand-side as a focus for studies of British commerce in the era of the industrial revolution. Finn joins a number of historians who have pointed out that some of the older, teleological, accounts of the rise of capitalism, based upon Victorian notions of progress, have resulted in a rather telescoped picture of the transition from 'status' to 'contract' relations and have thus also underestimated the persistence of the role of credit in the great transformations of the commercial, consumer, and industrial revolutions. She argues more clearly than ever before that credit remained a dynamic and fundamentally constitutive element of the British economy throughout all these.

The author draws penetrating insights from a range of primary materials illuminating individual experiences of debt as well as their representation in the broader cultural background. She takes literary sources very seriously and is better versed in current critical scholarship than most historians. Although occasionally resulting in some opaque passages of 'eng. lit. speak', her results set a new interdisciplinary standard for those interested in the relationship between contemporary fiction and history. Overall the book presents the reordering of credit over a long, slow, nineteenth century marked as much by continuity as by change. Finn emphasizes 'the protracted nature and partial effects of the eighteenth century's modernising impulses' (p. 327). She is able to make good use of, and dovetail, her findings with recent advances in legal history. Two central chapters deal with debt and imprisonment, again stressing the continuity of medieval customary privileges and conventions for some debtors inside the emerging reformed penal system. Changes in debt law, and changes in public attitudes towards the debtor, are painstakingly unravelled and analysed in a final part before drawing measured conclusions that should inspire further research and thinking.

Sustained engagement with, and development of, economic theory is less evident, amounting at times to a caricature. Adam Smith is charged with a 'simplistic anatomy of exchange' (p. 6) and the indictment is extended to the whole of the 'classical' and Marxist traditions of economic analysis. In anthropological traditions inspired by Marcel Mauss's essay on *The Gift*, Finn finds a more fruitful avenue of approach but there is no sustained working through of anthropological models or use of non-European comparative evidence.

There is relatively little recognition that debt acts as a powerful coercive force compelling persons to enter into the labour market and remain there under invidious circumstances (one recalls the North American bumper sticker: 'I owe, I owe, it's off to work I go'). Although she shows, in many rich case studies, how the credit relation is formed by and in turn reshapes class and gender relations, there is no sustained focus on the macrostructures of power, and the study arguably overstates the autonomy of symbolic representations from authority and property relations. Rhetorical conventions commonly used in the process of credit transactions are sometimes given rather more weight than they can bear,

as opposed to the substantive nature of the contract. Formal language used in the settling of accounts does not always mean that the credit arrangements themselves were similarly antiquated. The fact that a gentleman's tailor employed fawning and deferential tones in requesting the settlement of accounts does not necessarily imply that the exchange itself was anything but monetary in its nature, or that the relationship was anything but contractual. There remains much more to be said in acknowledgement of the richness of this study that cannot be crammed into a short review, and these slight quibbles about some of the shortcomings of economic history in the interpretative vein do not in any way detract from the importance of this book.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

RICHARD SHELDON

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05264816,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*The Enlightenment world*. Edited by Martin Fitzpatrick, Peter Jones, Christa Knellwolf, and Iain McCalman. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2004. Pp. xxii + 714. ISBN 0-415-21575-7. £130.00.

Scholars perennially re-write the Enlightenment in their own image. Some twenty-five years ago, Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich caught the prevailing mood of European diversity in a volume of essays on *The Enlightenment in national context* (Cambridge 1981). Now Martin Fitzpatrick, Peter Jones, Christa Knellwolf, and Iain McCalman present a major exploration of *The Enlightenment world* that reflects both the immense volume of further research and the theoretical developments of the last two decades. The result is a triumph. The work of thirty-nine contributors is organized in eight sections covering everything from 'the intellectual origins of Enlightenment' to a survey of the critics of the Enlightenment from the eighteenth century to the present.

A volume with so many contributors runs the risk of losing any cohesion. Remarkably, however, this project manages to combine an appreciation of the complexity and diversity of the subject with a more precise understanding of it. If the Enlightenment had a unity that often gave writers and readers a sense of identity, common philosophical and scientific assumptions, or simply an attitude of mind, it was also characterized by diversity. That was determined by differing national contexts, but also by regional and local circumstances, by professional and intellectual interests, by religious affiliation, by gender, and by age. The contributors aim to encompass as much as possible of this diversity, while at the same time recovering its meaning for the eighteenth century. As Peter Jones announces in his introduction to the first batch of essays on intellectual origins, he and his colleagues seek to approach the Enlightenment by 'unthinking' what we ourselves know and by tackling head on the problems of terminology as they manifested themselves both at the time and subsequently.

Several sections cover the kind of themes that one would perhaps expect. 'Intellectual origins' traces the scientific and religious antecedents of the seventeenth century. A particularly illuminating contribution by John Henry not only shows how Fellows of the Royal Society often combined the rhetoric of Bacon with the practice of Descartes, but also reveals the role of Boyle and Newton in undermining Cartesianism long before Voltaire mocked it as an 'ingenious romance'. The following sections on 'Enlightenment

formations' and the 'High Enlightenment' explore national contexts (with an especially fine piece by Hugh Dunthorne on the Dutch Republic) and key ideas. 'Reforming the Enlightenment world' contains sensitive analyses of the ways in which the 'optimism that this world could be made into a better place' (p. 424) was pursued in, and often against, an old order that increasingly both cried out for reform and proved surprisingly resilient. Essays on 'transformations and explorations' explore 'fantasies of paradise' in the South Seas (Jonathan Lamb) and 'cross-cultural encounters' in various parts of the globe (Dorinda Outram), while Jon Mee explores the often neglected millenarian visions of the age alongside the more familiar utopian speculations.

Three sections stand out and give the volume a novel character. Essays on polite culture and the arts explore issues of sensibility, politeness, and the function of nature and art in the Enlightenment. Thereafter, Cynthia Verba discusses the role of music and Peter Jones the significance of Italian operas and their audiences. Four essays on material culture analyse, on the one hand, encyclopedism and print culture, and, on the other, Enlightenment fashions – a quite outstanding essay by Peter McNeill – and popular culture. Finally, the 'Enlightenment and its critics' explores reactions against Enlightenment thinking from the early eighteenth century to the present. Eighteenth-century critics were often, in reality, proponents of alternative versions of Enlightenment. Ian Hunter discerns three conflicting Enlightenment programmes (anti-scholastic civil philosophy, anti-scholastic theological Enlightenment, and neo-scholastic Leibnizian metaphysics) at Halle before 1730 and Tom Furniss considers Rousseau as a protagonist of 'Romantic Enlightenment'. Burke, by contrast, appears as the first major exponent of counter-Enlightenment thinking and one who engaged with that movement in a more balanced way than Horkheimer and Adorno, against whose post-Hegelian distortions Kant is elegantly defended by Howard Williams. There is continuity, too, in feminist criticism of Enlightenment thinking. Around 1700 Mary Astell denounced the limitations of Locke's theories for women ('If all Men are born free', she asked, 'how is it that all Women are born slaves?') (p. 624). In the 1790s Mary Wollstonecraft's republican critique of an 'aristocratic' Enlightenment that allowed women only to be powerful through flirtation echoed Astell's complaints and set out issues that still preoccupy twenty-first-century feminists. Finally, postmodernism, in Susan Wilson's succinct and marvellously lucid account, represents the 'latest, and undoubtedly not the last, attempt to enlighten us about the strengths and the weaknesses of the philosophical traditions of the Enlightenment' (p. 658).

The volume embodies all the best features of the 'Routledge Worlds' series. The editors' prefaces to the eight sections provide useful orientation. Over eighty illustrations complement the text. Helpful short bibliographies guide the reader to the relevant literature, both primary and secondary. An exceptionally useful glossary exemplifies a typically Enlightenment concern with conceptual clarity and the communication of ideas. If an index of names is more or less standard, a superb subject index is sadly not something to be taken for granted these days, even in thematic collaborative works where it is essential: this volume is supplied with both.

It is rare that one can agree wholeheartedly with the hyperbole found on a dust jacket. However, in this case we really do have 'the best study of the Enlightenment World ever produced'.

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05274812,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*The murder of Mr Grebell: madness and civility in an English town.* By Paul Kléber Monod. London: Yale University Press, 2004. Pp. xi + 294. ISBN 0-300-0998-51. £25.00.

Historians have grown increasingly accustomed to the idea that nestling in small stories and local goings on are broad social, cultural, political, and economic patterns. Writers and readers alike may be enticed into such worlds by both the drama and the dazzling degree of detail that concentration on a limited geographical area can afford. Sometimes the dramatis personae are so fascinating, the acts committed so astonishing, and the characteristics of the locality so delightful that the levels of imaginative and emotional engagement are utterly satisfying. Yet, at the same time, the historical arguments, the meticulous modulations between evidence, claims, and interpretation need to be firmly in place. Many historians will readily grant the force and appeal of such an approach and have to hand a number of favourite examples. A small number of works that fit the description I have just given are repeatedly cited. Their success depends, I suspect, on the quality of the sources, the prevailing historical tastes of the moment, and the quality of the writing itself.

It is clear that Paul Monod set out to write a book that fits the account I have just given. The question, which to my mind must remain open, is the extent to which he has succeeded. The core story, a murder committed in Rye in 1743, is certainly dramatic, and out of it is drawn a number of threads: the history of Rye itself; intertwined social, religious, and political divisions over a long period of time; oligarchy and privilege in eighteenth-century England; the operations of the legal system; family sagas. A great deal rests on an act that remains hard, if not impossible, to explain, partly because of the fragmentary nature of the sources, many of which, Monod suggests, are highly interested concoctions. A murdered B whom he seems to have mistaken for C, the victim's brother-in-law. C then took charge of the prosecution, played many roles in the trial itself, which violated established practice of the time in many respects. Monod traces the lives and associations of the individuals involved, and tries to clarify who was who, given the existence of more than one person with the same name and elaborate networks that blended kinship and interests. Thus there is, I presume quite intentionally, a sense of the soap opera here, with scores being settled, pockets being lined, and emotions running high.

Monod writes well, and with a passion not just for the locality itself but for the misfortunes of the murderer John Breads, whom he sees as himself a victim. At times, the language he deploys is nakedly partisan. Furthermore, because the direct evidence is at times so patchy, the component of interpretation is large. Thus, while the central story is rich, or perhaps we should say potentially rich, the incompleteness of the records acts, it seems to me, to limit the viability of this venture as an ambitious historical account, of, for example, the growth of provincial civility. It is perhaps surprising, given the title, that this is not a book about madness at all, and what it says on the subject is mostly taken from familiar secondary sources. Yet the ambition of the work is entirely laudable, and in working simultaneously at a number of narrative, temporal, and geographical levels, it invites readers to reflect on important methodological issues, some of which I have already mentioned.

One of the most challenging issues the book raises, if more implicitly than explicitly, is the extent to which the particular sheds light on the general. In one sense it is made obvious how Rye helps us to understand eighteenth-century England – it was, Monod persuasively

shows, bound into national concerns, by virtue of its location and economic profile, and hence its integration into political networks. But does that mean, as the dust jacket succinctly puts it, that ‘the history of Rye *mirrored* that of the whole nation’ (my emphasis)? I think not, rather its very distinctiveness allows it to be used as one lens through which to observe certain phenomena. Taking Rye, and taking Allen Grebell’s murder, is a device, and how well it works depends, as I have suggested, on a number of factors, including the reader’s willingness to be seduced. What affects that seduction? The answer will naturally depend on the reader, but it is worth noting the extent to which Rye itself is cast as the leading attraction: Monod draws attention to the association with the writers, Henry James – the murder victim lived and died in James’s house – and E. F. Benson, who later occupied it. For this, and for many other reasons, Rye holds special appeal.

*The murder of Mr Grebell* is a stimulating, and well-crafted book. In some places, the research processes are made evident, and the questions of how clues and leads are dealt with can be considered. Since a number of lines of investigation are followed, and the work is organized thematically, with chapters on ‘Oligarchs’, ‘Politeness and police’, for example, rather than chronologically, it speaks to the nature of historical argument and narrative. Where possible, there is a plenitude of detail, and readers are expected to pay careful attention to the intricacies of the plots. Yet large historical matters are always present, so that, whatever the delightful particularities of Rye itself, broad vistas invite careful and critical inspection.

DOWNING COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

LUDMILLA JORDANOVA

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05284819,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*Conjectures of order: intellectual life and the American South, 1810–1860.* By Michael O’Brien. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004. Pp. xvii + 1354. ISBN 0-8078-2800-9. \$90.00.

Even today, it is not uncommon to encounter respectable American historians who consider the phrase ‘Southern intellectual history’ an oxymoron. They will have to wrestle with the full weight (and it is considerable) of Michael O’Brien’s magisterial two-volume work, *Conjectures of order: intellectual life and the American South, 1810–1860*. In addition to demonstrating the unexpectedly vibrant, diverse, and learned world of antebellum white Southern thinkers, O’Brien situates their world squarely within the common trajectories of trans-Atlantic thought, moving, roughly, from a late Enlightenment sensibility through Romanticism to, finally, a modernism recognizable as an early form of realism, capturing throughout the idiosyncrasies that made the American South itself and not somewhere else. Ranging across the disciplines from poetry to political economy, O’Brien lovingly, if critically, recreates the high social and intellectual worlds of the Old South, a place where men pondered the classics, read the new German philosophers in the original, and, occasionally, ‘gleefully fished out a tumbled oyster from between a startled woman’s breasts’ (p. 1192). After this book, anyone who continues to treat American intellectual history as the story of ‘William James and a few of his friends’ (as O’Brien put it a few years back) will do so out of sheer wilfulness.

Spanning the years 1810–60, the work is organized into two volumes of three parts each, plus a postscript on Southern thought after 1865. Volume I describes the social context of Southern thought, and examines patterns of travel and migration (crucial in understanding the training and standing of Southern intellectuals in the worlds of philosophy, political economy, and theology, and their capacity for ‘cultural travelling’); the formation of ideas about race, gender, ethnicity, locality, and class; and the variety and structures of discourse, not excluding conversation and correspondence. Volume II concerns itself with ‘the social and the metaphysical imaginations’. Here the author focuses on the key genres of Southern thought, including history, biography, literary criticism, fiction, politics, and theology. Accompanied by a hundred illustrations, as well as a ninety-page bibliography, a comprehensive and accurate index, and, happily, footnotes, *Conjectures of order* bristles with erudition, shrewd judgement, and understated argumentation. Wit abounds, as does irony: as when the author quotes approvingly on page 987 – about three-quarters of the way through the book – Laurence Stern’s opinion that the truest respect that the properly managed writer can pay to the reader’s understanding ‘is to halve [his] matter amicably’.

Anything short of a review essay will necessarily fail to convey adequately the scope of the historical and intellectual questions addressed in these volumes and the breadth of learning contained within them: *Conjectures of order* is a monumental achievement. Still, in the course of taking a broad, almost encyclopaedic, approach to antebellum Southern thought, O’Brien has at heart several fundamental goals, and these will be the focus of this review.

O’Brien’s first, even animating, concern is to place Southern life and thought firmly within the trans-Atlantic community of ideas, to set Southern cities – Charleston, in particular – on a map whose points of reference are less Boston and New York than Edinburgh, Göttingen, London, and Paris. A second, related, goal is to establish this cosmopolitan South’s place within the modern world and to rebut those who consider Southern intellectual thought synonymous with conservatism. As opposed to Eugene D. Genovese (with whom he disagrees on almost every point), O’Brien considers the Old South ‘not as premodern but deeply implicated in modernity, though an idiosyncratic version mostly based on slavery’ (p. 17).

O’Brien’s South is less coherent than Genovese’s, less focused on slaveholding, and the plantation is not the epicentre of Southern intellectual life. Instead, intellectual life focuses around the region’s handful of cities and university towns, above all Charleston and the state capital, Columbia, which was, owing to the combined collections of South Carolina College and the state legislature, ‘the richest place in the South to be placed for books’ (p. 520). The reader may wonder if these university voices had any greater reach in the antebellum South than those of their counterparts today. Less cynically, we might ask whether the claims of a society to be modern (whether in terms of art, economics, philosophy, or politics) can be measured merely by demonstrating the presence of ideas in that society, without asking to what extent these ideas mediated or structured the lived experience of the broader population.

Dismissing the argument that the existence of slavery proves, *ipso facto*, the South’s lack of modernity, O’Brien does note that the tendency (visible in Calhoun, as well as the work of some historians) to see the world of slavery as ‘a series of island communities, as small worlds presided over by a patriarchal master, around whose feet clustered wife and children, overseer and slaves’ (p. 959) made slavery seem more anti-modern than it actually was. Following O’Brien’s argument, it seems inappropriate at best to define a society that produced James Warley Miles – who realized that ‘widespread atheism was

about to become a historical possibility, perhaps a probability' (p. 1109) – as either pre- or anti-modern. This is not to say that O'Brien never strains in his efforts to portray antebellum Southerners as more modern than the moderns as, for instance, when he casts James Johnston Pettigrew as a precursor to George Santayana (p. 1173). But he is on firm ground when discussing Southern women writers who, curiously, seem more modern than their men. Augusta Jane Evans's 1859 novel *Beulah* is presented here as 'coming close' to anticipating William James on the varieties of religious experience, and as 'preeminently a novel of ideas, a work of such high intellectual and abstract seriousness that it is impossible to find its companion in antebellum American literature' (pp. 1162, 1170). But it is the diarist, Mary Chesnut, who carries the argument home through her involvement in the process that created modernism: that is, 'in stripping Romanticism of the consolatory hope that human intelligence could make moral patterns out of the world's disorder, in hazarding the contrary conjecture that the direction of the human condition could be downward or meaningless, but fleetingly intelligible in art' (p. 1188). Chesnut's description of the post-war South was that of a world of motion, 'full of strange vicissitudes, and in nothing more remarkable than the way people are reconciled, ignore the past, and start afresh in life, here to incur more disagreements and set to bickering again' (p. 1196). In addition to being decidedly modernist, these words constitute the most concise description of the post-war reunion of North and South ever penned.

Warned at the outset that 'an intellectual history is not a democratic venture' (p. 17), *Conjectures of order* is, as might be expected, an overwhelmingly white book: even the chapter entitled 'Our slavery question' assumes the perspective of those who, indeed, considered slavery *their* problem. As with the pro-slavery argument, in which the slaves themselves dropped out along the way, the peculiar relations of slavery matter very little here: although O'Brien is at pains to recognize that all the pro-slavery works he covers 'were written within a few yards of particular slaves, many of whose experiences and voices and bodies were used and known, however imperfectly' (p. 992). Distanced from the slave quarters, O'Brien's narrative nevertheless notes the centrality of slavery for Southern thought, seeing it as a source of centrifugal force. He writes, 'Slavery itself was an education in uncertainty, a daily struggle of the will ... Making an empire, making a republic, making a democracy, making prosperity, all these would have been hard enough to hold together, but to drive the project forward while holding millions in bondage produced a cultural anxiety of stark proportions' (p. 7). It remains an open question whether those historians who consider Southern thinking on slavery as rooted in the day-to-day events of the household will be convinced by O'Brien's argument that 'In truth, real slaves had never been central [to pro-slavery thought]' (p. 991).

Equally interesting and revisionist is O'Brien's denial of the centrality of slavery to Southern political thought, if not to Southern politics. Preoccupied with broad questions of nation-building and market regulation, the South's antebellum intellectuals did not, in the main, focus on slavery. 'In general,' O'Brien explains, 'when Southerners thought formally about government, *tout court*, they were inattentive to slavery, a problem they left to be settled by the specialized genre of the proslavery argument' (p. 824). As with theology, political thought was a Southern export, and covered a broader spectrum than most historians, focused as they are on the unravelling of the Union, appreciate. O'Brien's aim is to broaden the cast of characters and, thereby, the issues. As he notes, 'Merely to observe that the South had John Marshall, Andrew Jackson, John Taylor, John C. Calhoun, and



Beverly Tucker, all very different men, is to see how fissiparous was the debate and how variously the problems of power, equality, democracy, and rights were there analyzed' (p. 781). The author's portrait of Thomas Cooper, a lesser but still intriguing figure, is a case in point. A free-market supporter like Taylor and Thomas Dew, in Cooper we hear the voice of the émigré: the man who had been driven out of England by Pitt, jailed by the Federalists for seditious journalism, and ejected for the sin of scepticism from the presidency of South Carolina College by Presbyterians. *Laissez faire* meant more to Cooper than economics: it meant liberty of thought as well, and drove him to articulate a theory of equal protection of the laws – a concept, it is supposed, that was imposed on the South by the Fourteenth Amendment (p. 901).

O'Brien has made some interesting character choices in what is, in many ways, a collective biography. Jefferson (who survived into the period under discussion here) makes only fleeting appearances, whereas many pages are devoted to Henry Hughes, who even O'Brien admits was 'an oddity beyond the pale of conventional Southern thought' (p. 972). Poets are given their due, as are the South's female novelists (about the only Southern intellectuals to make writing pay) and a handful of female political thinkers, whom O'Brien treats with particular insight and care. (He is often at his best when writing about the South's women, as when he notes blandly that 'No woman was allowed public speech if her body was present' and refers to Southern marriage as 'a republican purdah' (p. 264).) Germans populate the text to a remarkable degree for the simple reason that German thinkers such as the natural scientist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach were as central to Southern thinking about race as the more usual American suspects such as Josiah Nott (whose influence, if not intellect, O'Brien takes seriously). And George Fitzhugh, who is commonly trotted out as the most prominent Southern political economist of the 1850s, is included more for his stylistic innovations than anything else (p. 1198).

By the end of these volumes, there may still be a few who will wonder if an intellectual history of the American South can help answer the large questions that structure the history of the region. O'Brien has no doubts on this score: his final goal for *Conjectures of order* is to claim a place at the table of Civil War causation for the South's leading intellectuals, whom he characterizes collectively as retaining 'a revolutionary frame of mind' and who, when they 'began to think that the United States was no longer a thing they could control, ... did not hesitate to destroy it and make another world' (p. 3). This was no bumbling generation. The South, O'Brien makes clear, chose its own way 'with clarity of mind'. 'Intelligent, learned, creative, even self-aware', Southern intellectuals 'gambled to sustain their own power which, they had carefully explained to themselves and the world, needed to be exercised at someone else's expense' (p. 1199).

Was the Civil War, then, a clash among opposing visions of modernity? Such a question is beyond the scope of *Conjectures of order*. Nor is the author in a position to make a strong comparative claim. Even if we accept all the arguments about the modernity of the trans-Atlantic South, the task of comparing modernities is always (as contemporary philosophers such as Charles Taylor have tried to show) intellectually fraught and politically charged. *Conjectures of order* does not ask us to believe that the South was 'more modern' than the North. What these two breathtaking volumes achieve is to make the contrary gesture impossible to sustain.

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05294815.

© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*The last great quest: Captain Scott's Antarctic sacrifice.* By Max Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xvi + 352. ISBN 0-19-280483-9. £20.00.

For much of the twentieth century Captain Scott occupied a place in the pantheon of great explorers hardly inferior to that of Livingstone. While interest in Livingstone has been kept alive by a succession of biographies, both hero-worshipping and debunking, Scott has almost vanished from historical treatments of Edwardian Britain. For example, in the recently published New Oxford History for this period, G. R. Searle's *A new England?* (2004), no mention is made of the exploits in the frozen South which once enthralled the nation. The main reason for this neglect is that the epic of Antarctic discovery appears relatively self-contained: no great national interests were at stake, and international rivalry amounted to little more than a projection of the personal rivalries engendered by the race for the Pole. In addition the harvest of scientific findings was comparatively slight and the Antarctic scarcely impinged on the national epic of the civilizing mission. Yet if the history of the twentieth century was not significantly foreshadowed by Scott's journeys, they are worth close attention for the light they shed on the national mood of Edwardian Britain. Max Jones was drawn to his subject as one means of understanding the outlook of the generation that fought in the First World War. As a result he is much more sensitive than previous writers to the full range of meanings which were invested in the Scott story. Jones has some useful correctives to make about Scott himself. In particular he is anxious to reclaim his scientific credentials, rather than to have him dismissed as interested only in a 'mere dash to the Pole'; and he expresses cautious scepticism with regard to the revisionist onslaught on Scott's professional reputation. But this is not a biography: Scott's career takes up little more than thirty pages; the rest of the book is given over to the reception of Scott's death in the public discourse and imagery of the day.

Exploration during this period – or exploration which was sponsored or funded by public bodies – trod an uneasy path between scientific research and sensationalism. From the 1880s onwards, the Royal Geographical Society increasingly defined its priority as 'measuring the world' rather than 'measuring men', as Jones puts it (pp. 29, 48). Yet the British Antarctic Expedition of 1910–12 was only partially financed by the RGS. A substantial balance came from public subscription, including donations from schools all over the country. Popular interest was not drawn to scientific observations, but to the immense human challenge involved in beating the Norwegians to the South Pole. The fate of the expedition was almost bound to be mythologized, and the process was strongly influenced by Scott himself. Jones demonstrates how attentive Scott had been to his public reputation since his first voyage south. In his 'Message to the public', penned during his last days, he calmly faced up to his impending death while appealing explicitly to national pride. From the moment the disaster was made public in February 1913 Scott's last expedition was represented in terms which contradicted the austere ideals that had been promoted by the RGS for thirty years.

Drawing on press comment, public monuments, sermons, political speeches, and photographs, Jones charts the dimensions of the national response to Scott's last journey. Given such a variety of sources, one would not expect unanimity. For example, Scott's supposed virtues were invoked by both militarists and pacifists, while the class divisions in the Royal Navy were uncomfortably laid bare in the withholding of heroic status from

Petty Officer Edgar Evans. But even so, there was an impressive consistency about the public interpretation of the tragedy. Most obviously it advertised a specific form of manliness: not only physical courage, endurance, and self-discipline, which were enjoined on every schoolboy in the land, but the more exacting standard of self-sacrifice, as emphasized in the sub-title of this book. Captain Oates's celebrated disappearance into the blizzard could hardly be construed in any other way, but Scott himself and his remaining three comrades were also widely revered as 'martyrs'. As to the cause in which they were martyred, some answered 'science', but the common assumption was that these men had died for the nation: not only in the sense that the Antarctic could be construed as a national project, but because in proving what British men were capable of they had set a standard for their compatriots. Given the agonized doubts expressed about the state of British manhood between the Boer War and the First World War, it is scarcely surprising that this message was highly valued and highly inflated. Ultimately Scott's last expedition was embraced as a metaphor of masculine renewal: it was, as he put it in his 'Message to the Public', a tale to stir 'the heart of every Englishman' (p. 298).

Scott's life and death served to entrench ideals of nation and gender which were already securely established, and which within a few years would become a cruel anachronism. Reason enough for their neglect by historians, perhaps, but in analysing them with such a wealth of documentation, Max Jones has performed a valuable service to the cultural history of Edwardian Britain.

ROEHAMPTON UNIVERSITY

JOHN TOSH

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X0530481X,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*In the shadow of the rising sun: Shanghai under Japanese occupation.* Edited by Christian Henriot and Wen-hsin Yeh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xii + 392. ISBN 0-521-82221-1. £50.00.

This volume, edited by two internationally respected China scholars, brings together papers by researchers from France, Britain, and America, three foreign countries with a strong interest in pre-liberation Shanghai. We have long been used to analysing China's anti-Japanese bases as discrete but interconnected, rather than masterminded by a single command. Henriot and Yeh take a similar approach to wartime Shanghai, concentrating on the local articulation of coping and resisting. Research questions include the war's effect on Shanghai's material landscape and the relationship between resistance and collaboration. The focus is on economy, politics, and culture rather than on fighting, of which Shanghai saw relatively little. Contributors also explore the city's hinterland connections. The volume maintains the standard distinction between the Lonely Island period (1937–41), when the city was unoccupied but surrounded, and the ensuing years of Japanese occupation.

Part One looks at the wartime economy. Most contributors conclude that only after Pearl Harbour was the city effectively cut off. A spectacular boom began in 1938 but ended after 1940, when the economy span into a decline caused by the occupiers' introduction of blockades and a system of monopolies aimed at strengthening their rule. But not everyone succumbed to paralysis. Some continued to enrich themselves, as Parks Coble shows in his

essay on Shanghai's Rong family. Others, the 'fixers', kept trade routes open in league with the Japanese and their collaborators and with representatives of Chiang Kai-shek's government (exiled in Chongqing). Among the most successful fixers was Xu Guanqun, described by Sherman Cochrane in his essay on marketing medicine across enemy lines. In an account of communist trafficking out of the metropolis, Allison Rottmann shows how party agents channelled people, money, materials, and intelligence to the Central China bases by mobilizing social connections. Thanks to its relationship with Shanghai, the New Fourth Army acquired a sophistication not usually associated with rural revolution.

Part Two tackles themes in wartime politics. Citing files of the Shanghai Municipal Archives, Timothy Brook analyses the little-known Great Way Government of December 1937 to April 1938, which had scant impact but is interesting as wartime China's first puppet authority. More substantial was the Shanghai United Committee (SUC), run jointly by the exiled Guomindang and Du Yuesheng's Green Gang, in a renewal of the compact Chiang Kai-shek formed in 1927 to ensure his grip on the city. Brian Martin uses Municipal Police Files, Executive Yuan Archives, and memoirs to trace the SUC's transition to accommodation with the puppets.

Highlights of the volume are the scrupulously researched studies by Robert Bickers on the decolonization of the International Settlement and by Christine Cornet on the French Concession. Bickers shows how British diplomats, allied with British multinationals and big Chinese firms, used the war to seize back the Shanghai Municipal Council from the settler interest, the so-called 'Shanghaianders'. Cornet searches archives of the French Foreign Ministry and Shanghai's French Administrative Council to trace the ending of the French Concession by agreement between the puppets of Vichy and Nanjing. Neither government recognized the other. Both expired in 1945, leaving a mess the post-war Chinese government tidied up in 1946.

Part Three explores cultural change. In a study of commercial radio on the Lonely Island, Carlton Benson shows how patriotic propaganda reverted after 1937 to pre-war-style advertising and entertainment, both for economic reasons and because of imperialist pressures. The article concludes with an interesting but brief comparison of wartime broadcasting in Shanghai, Moscow, and Paris. Three other contributions take women as their theme. Susan Glosser looks at Shanghai's communist women's journal, which promoted traditional practices such as thrift and nurturing. Nicole Huang identifies a rupture in women's print culture, from resistance literature on the Lonely Island to an emphasis on domesticity under the occupation. Paul Pickowicz contributes a post-war perspective, by analysing a communist-authored drama about wartime women.

Historians will welcome the new angles and information these articles provide. Missing is an analysis of perceptions in Chongqing and in Mao Zedong's Yan'an of the city's strategic potential in the military endgame, which both sides pondered and prepared. Also absent is an account of underground communist activity in Shanghai itself, although Rottmann expertly explores the New Fourth Army tie. The editors justify the overwhelming focus on women in Part Three by arguing that the occupation 'feminized' Shanghai publishing. However, it would seem to have more to do with changing trends in scholarship than with the reality of wartime culture, which merited a broader treatment.

Compartmentalizing the Chinese resistance into regions is by now standard practice in western scholarship. This approach will serve its purpose only if it is seen as a stage in the search for higher truths about war and revolution, in China and the world, rather than as an end in itself. Some of the contributions to this volume are excessively narrow, even given

the limits of their Shanghai focus. The chance to analyse occupied cities in broader perspective was also let slip, despite parallels with France.

The copy could have been far better styled. The conventions used in lists and citations lack consistency. Some of the writing by scholars whose first language is French deserved a better polishing than it got. The photos are rare and fascinating, but there is no list of them. Nor is there of the plentiful and often obscure abbreviations. Nor is there a map, a baffling omission given that Shanghai's geography was not only complicated but highly relevant to its politics.

CARDIFF UNIVERSITY

GREGOR BENTON

*The Historical Journal*, 48 (2005). doi:10.1017/S0018246X05314816,  
© 2005 Cambridge University Press

*After the imperial turn: thinking with and through the nation*. Edited by Antoinette Burton. (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003). Pp. 369. ISBN 0-8223-3142-X. Paperback \$23.95.

I confess I picked up this book without much enthusiasm. It is hard to welcome the news that another 'turn' is now behind us, especially since – what with classes to teach and children to raise – I am not sure I properly made the last one. But its wearying title misleads, for this is in fact a great collection. Although many of the volume's contributors hail from the linked fields of British history, 'new imperial' history, English literature, or cultural studies, they are in fact probably better defined by academic location, analytical formation, and cast of mind than by national 'field' – which is simply to say that they themselves express perfectly that dependence on but discomfort with national categories that is the volume's main concern. These scholars are mostly American, mostly young, with impeccable credentials, and fiercely bright, and by spending a few hours in their strong-minded but engaging company the reader will come away with a vivid and, to my mind, not inaccurate sense of the pleasures and challenges faced by working (that is, teaching and writing) historians in the United States right now.

There are three kinds of essays in this book (in my view, that is; the editor has divided them up somewhat differently). A first set discusses the way issues of nation and empire figure within particular historiographical fields. One or two dwell too passionately on interpretive battles baffling to those outside that field, but some are gems. In the aptly titled 'We've just started making national histories and you want us to stop already?', Ann Curthoys provides an illuminating account of the ways in which its colonial status impeded the development of national history in Australia, and hence of the problematic nature here of an 'imperial turn' (or, really, 're-turn'). Lora Wildenthal perceptively explains the reasons for German historians' amnesia about Germany's imperial past; Tony Ballatyne argues that imperial relations should be understood not within a centre-periphery framework but as a kind of web. But my favourite essay among this group is Robert Gregg's splenetic and very funny skewering of the recent endorsement of an 'international turn' by the doyens of the Organization of American Historians ('Making the World Safe for American History'), a 'turn' whose muddle-headedness he finds captured perfectly in a recent invitation-only meeting to discuss this project held (as all good conference-cum-boondoggles should be!) at the Villa La Pietra in Florence. ('Let's be honest now', Gregg

writes disarmingly, 'My real beef with the OAH's conference on internationalizing the study of American history at La Pietra was that I was not a participant. Had I been invited ... I would be endorsing the *La Pietra Report* in a snap, like all the other worthies on the participant list' (p. 173.) It is nice for us he was not invited, though, for exclusion provides him with the perspective (or perhaps just the animus) to point out that – as should be obvious to anyone taking a cab, buying a newspaper, or simply spending five minutes contemplating the furnishings and appliances of their own home – one scarcely needs to travel to Florence to understand how utterly 'global' is the history of this mature settler state. As Gregg mildly proposes, 'internationalizing American history might be more effectively demonstrated by endeavouring to bring out the global buried within the local' (p. 171).

A second set of essays demonstrates how this might be done. They fall, in other words, into that particular genre of historical writing that treats a relatively narrow topic, event, or set of sources (some examples here being identity documents, post-colonial novels, Victorian popular newspapers, the Hong Kong police) and demonstrates how they reveal larger cultural patterns, relations, or themes. It is in the nature of such work occasionally to overreach (and some do here), but at their best these sorts of micro-studies do show how cultural products can both symbolize and become tools within both global and local relations of power. Kristin Hoganson's essay on fashion does this particularly well: turn-of-the-century American women, she writes, 'clung to the Paris-based fashion system' identified with 'aristocratic' values at a moment when globalizing commerce and media were threatening established hierarchies 'in part to prove their civilizational distance from the world's dispossessed' (p. 275). Likewise, Hsu-Ming Teo mines the ubiquitous genre of the romance novel for its racial messages: although its preoccupations changed over time, no genre, she convincingly shows, worked harder to marginalize colonized subjects, restrict agency to Europeans, and sustain the fantasy of the 'white nation'. One could proliferate the topics ripe for this kind of analysis almost without end.

Which brings us, of course, to the question of what this 'de-centring' of the nation, this expansion of our 'archive' to include almost every dead or living thing, has meant for the academy, that particular intersection of the global and the local in which we work and live. A third set of essays in the book offers some answers to this question. Antoinette Burton, in her introduction, is the most programmatic, sketching a manichean battle between a creative, vibrant, theoretically informed, heterodox, but sadly undervalued, scholarship critical of the 'sovereign ontological' status accorded the nation (a scholarship epitomized here by Paul Gilroy) and an established 'reactionary imperial history' aimed at 'safeguarding Britain's national heritage' identified here with P. J. Marshall (pp. 4–5). But is Gilroy's work really 'woefully underengaged', given that the *amazon.com* website lists three paperbacks merrily outselling anything by Marshall – and, for that matter, is King's College London so much more central to empire than the universities of the Ivy League? If we are to read scholarly work this politically, we need to explain why today *both* critics of empire and their market-savvy defenders find more comfortable institutional homes and wider popular audiences in the United States than in Britain – a fact that has brought Niall Ferguson (surely a more appropriate candidate for the role of chief imperial apologist than the gently liberal Marshall) homing to our shores. Usefully, then, a second essay (by Terri A. Hasseler and Paula M. Krebs) actually delves into that American academic marketplace, using the Modern Language Association's job register to find out how stateside English departments have accommodated and incorporated the 'imperial turn'.

(Departments, they discover, are confused and opportunistic, tending to collapse the goals of minority representation, teaching of post-colonial literature, and coverage of 'theory', a practice that has left many young scholars impossibly burdened with huge geographical surveys and theory/method courses and unable to teach the more specialized literatures they themselves study.) Finally, two scholars discuss their own classroom experiences and practices. Many American scholars will recognize their students, I imagine, in the exam essays Susan Pennybacker excerpts from her teaching at Trinity – essays that show how hard it is to wean students of the ubiquitous American tendency to interpret all experiences and narratives (whether of eighteenth-century plantation slavery or twentieth-century Salford) through the lens of individual self-actualization and 'improvement'. But it is Heather Streets's heartfelt account of her travails teaching the 'new' imperial history as a young untenured professor at Washington State University that really brought me up short. For three years, a largely white group of students (some in the Reserve Officer Training Corps) flocked to her class – and each year, Streets watched those white students re-enact a drama of identification with Britain's 'civilizing mission', at times even turning in anger or distress ('it's not my fault') on the small number of politically dissident and/or non-white students in the class. Yet Streets persevered. Jettisoning lectures for discussion, and turning to advantage the ubiquitous email discussions that now blight our existence, Streets led her students to confront, and then to debate, the record of violence and conflict attendant on any imperial history. Some became alienated and angry, but for others the class was clearly a revelation, leading them to rethink reflexively triumphalist American narratives as well. This is an unblinkered and remarkably acute portrait of the front lines of US mass higher education, but I was left oddly heartened. With Streets and others like her in these trenches, perhaps we have some hope of stopping the American imperial juggernaut yet.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SUSAN PEDERSEN